

PERSONNEL COMMISSION

MINUTES

June 21, 2006

9:00 a.m., Board Room

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Miriam Rothman, Commissioner
Bert Seal, Commissioner

Present:

Susan Dixon, Alicia Their, Lisa Nguyen, Mike
Reese, Roger Jones and Shauna Stark.

Visitors: Drena Jipson, Allan Manangan, Les
Welge, Uyen Quach, Anna Spaulding, Julia
Villarreal, Heidi Schlageter, Chris Iandolo,
Simone Grays, Jem Turman.

Secretary:

Michele Fort-Merrill

Recording Secretary:

Diane Herrera

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the minutes of the Personnel Commission meeting of March 3, 2006.
- MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the minutes of the Personnel Commission meeting of April 26, 2006

3. SECOND READING - 2006-07 PERSONNEL COMMISSION BUDGET

- MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the Personnel Commission budget for 2006-07 as presented.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

- None

5. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

- Legislative Report, June 2, 2006, presented for information.

6. RATIFICATION OF ACTIONS BY DIRECTOR

- **Reclassify vacant position #7963 from Building Maintenance Specialist, R54 to Skilled Maintenance Worker, R51, Maintenance and Operations, Business Services – Susan Dixon**
-The Director of Maintenance and Operations has determined the need for a staff member who will be dedicated to performing routine skilled and unskilled tasks. The duties to be assigned are consistent with the classification of Skilled Maintenance Worker. The recommendation is to approve the action by the Director to reclassify vacant position #7963 from Building Maintenance Specialist, R54 to Skilled Maintenance Worker, R51. MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the recommendation as presented.
- **Reclassify vacant positions 7224, 7463, and 7839 from Outdoor Education Program Specialist, R41, to Cabin Assistant, R28, Outdoor Education, Student Services – Susan Dixon**
-The Senior Director, Outdoor Education, will reorganize positions as they become vacant to ensure that the maximum number of staff are employed by the program and realize savings for the program

budget. The recommendation is to approve action by the Director to reclassify vacant positions 7224, 7463 and 7839 from Outdoor Education Program Specialist, R41 to Cabin Assistant, R28. MSC (Rothman/Beal) to approve the recommendation as presented.

•

7. CLASSIFICATION/SALARY RECOMMENDATION

• Job Description Updates

-None

• Classification of Positions (New)

-Occupational Therapy Assistant, R52, NCCSE (2 positions) and North Inland SELPA (1 position), Student Services – Susan Dixon

The NCCSE and North Inland SELPA offices have received additional funding from member districts to hire additional staff members to assist in the delivery of occupational therapy services. The typical tasks the incumbents will perform are consistent with the class description of Occupational Therapy Assistant. The recommendation is to classify three new positions (2 at NCCSE, 1 at North Inland SELPA) as Occupational Therapy Assistants, R42 of the classified support staff salary schedule. MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the recommendation as presented.

-Occupational Therapist, R64, NCCSE, Student Services – Susan Dixon

The NCCSE has received funding from member districts to hire an additional person to provide occupational therapy services to students. The typical tasks the incumbent will perform are consistent with the class description of Occupational Therapist. The recommendation is to classify one new position at NCCSE as an Occupational Therapist, R64 of the classified support staff salary schedule. MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the recommendation as presented.

• Establish New Classification

-None

• Classification Reviews

-Network Analyst I, R58, vacant position #8024 to Web Programmer, R55, Network Services, Human Resources and Technology – Susan Dixon

The Network Services Manager has reevaluated the needs of the school districts and SDCOE departments and has determined that there is a need for a staff member to provide web-programming services. The assigned duties are consistent with the job classification of Web Programmer. The recommendation is to reclassify vacant position #8024 from Network Analyst I, R58 to Web Programmer, R55. MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the recommendation as presented.

• Classification Reviews Window Period

-Classified Review Request – see attached reports

Mike Reese, CSEA President, addressed the Commission to express CSEA concerns regarding the reclassification review process. Mike stated his understanding of the purpose of the Personnel Commission is to ensure fairness and that CSEA recognizes the authority of the Superintendent and appreciates the opportunity to be involved in the reclassification process. During the past two years, CSEA has not challenged any reclassification. However, CSEA has concerns over comments made by Michele Fort Merrill. CSEA's first concern is Michele Fort-Merrill stated that the Personnel Commission is not an appeal process for Human Resource decisions. CSEA feels that the Personnel Commission should not only hear from incumbents, but that incumbents should be encouraged to

speaking with the Personnel Commission. Another CSEA concern is that managers have been told that it is not appropriate for them to address the Personnel Commission in support of the incumbent. CSEA disagrees with this.

CSEA has not seen the rules and procedures in regards to reclassification requests. The reclassification form was changed by Human Resources two years ago. The form is complicated and intimidating. This year, some CSEA members did not hear from Human Resources until a letter denying their request was sent. This letter did not inform incumbents of their right to address the Personnel Commission, nor did it state the date and time of the next meeting. CSEA believes that each reclassification request needs to be studied on an individual basis, with Human Resources speaking directly to each incumbent. Currently, incumbents do not feel that they are part of the process.

CSEA is asking that Human Resources do four things:

1. interview each incumbent who completes a reclassification request
2. interview each supervisor for every incumbent
3. contact the employee when the review is completed
4. notify the employee of the date, time and location of the Personnel Commission meeting.

Michele Fort Merrill responded to Mike Reese's comments. Michele stated that there seems to be a misunderstanding between Human Resources and CSEA. Michele and Mike have been emailing each other back and forth regarding reclassification requests. Human Resources has no interest in denying employee access to the Personnel Commission meetings.

Human Resources must maintain a balance between the emotional aspect of reclassification requests and the professional effort of staff and managers in order to keep the integrity of the process. Employees have access to the Personnel Commission and Human Resources does nothing to prevent this access.

Changes to the reclassification form were discussed with, and approved by, CSEA. The questionnaire was changed because the previous two-page document did not provide the employee ample space within which to describe their position. Michele stated that she has discussed the reclassification process with Mike and informed him of the reclassification process. As part of the notification process, employees were informed that if they had questions regarding the process, they could contact Susan Dixon. Some employees did, others did not.

Michele explained that it is not necessary that each employee be interviewed. Each review request is reviewed in Human Resources and not all reviews require an interview. Employees are informed of the results of the review and invited to contact Human Resources if they have questions or concerns or wish to discuss the matter further. Supervisors are also contacted. Employees are notified of the results with the time and date of the Personnel Commission meeting. If that was not done this year, it was an oversight.

We have a good process for reclassification reviews. Staff held discussions regarding the process and we look at the processes for other districts. There is a direct relationship between the Superintendent and reclassification requests and how the Superintendent organizes the organization. Cabinet has reviewed and approved the reclassification request recommendations.

The appeal process is not an opportunity for public detailed review of incumbents' positions. The Personnel Commission should not be asked to do a 15-20 minute review of job descriptions after staff has spent time doing a review of the review requests. This is unfair to the Personnel Commission. The Personnel Commission meeting is a time for an incumbent to bring forward something that may have been missed by staff during the review process.

Mike stated that he has enjoyed working with the Human Resources staff, but he believes the process is flawed. It should be employee friendly.

Michele addressed the issue of managers being directed not to attend the Personnel Commission meeting in support of the incumbent. It is the policy of the Superintendent that once a decision has been reached by the Superintendent it becomes a recommendation of the SDCOE. It is not appropriate for a manager to publicly oppose management's recommendation.

Miriam Rothman stated that CSEA and Human Resources work well together. There may have been some misunderstanding between the two. Miriam believes both groups come to the table with a spirit of collaboration. Miriam asked that CSEA and Human Resources work out their issues and report back to the Commission once the differences have been settled.

Michele Fort Merrill requested that no action be taken on the reclassification window period recommendations until that process can be reviewed. Michele stated that the County Office of Education met every deadline prescribed by the Merit System Rules and Regulations for the Classified Service.

MSC (Rothman/Seal) to postpone action on the reclassification window period requests until such time as CSEA and Human Resources review the process, but no later than September 30, 2006.

8. OTHER ITEMS

- Set meeting dates for 2006-07

Proposed dates (3rd Wednesday of the month)

July 19, 2006

~~September 20, 2006~~ September 22, 2006

October 18, 2006

November 15, 2006

December 20, 2006

January 17, 2007

February 21, 2007

March 21, 2007

April 18, 2007

May 16, 2007

June 20, 2007

Discussion was held regarding the proposed meeting dates for the 2006-07 fiscal year. Miriam Rothman suggested moving the September 20 meeting to September 22, 2006. MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the proposed meeting dates as amended.

9. POSITION ANNOUNCEMENTS

- #092-05 - Network Analyst II
- #096-05 – Cabin Assistant
- #097-05 – Office Systems Technician I
- #100-05 – Technology Center Support Technician
- #101-05 – Payroll Technician
- #102-05 – Administrative Assistant IV
- #103-05 – Clerk/Typist II
- #110-05 – Systems Technician I - ROP

10. ELIGIBILITY LISTS

- #005-05 – Clerk Typist II
- #074-05 – Project Specialist Project Peace – Outreach
- #085-05 – Receptionist/Office Assistant Bilingual
- #086-05 – Speech-Language Pathology Assistant
- #092-05 – Network Analyst II
- #097-05 – Office Systems Technician I
- #101-05 – Payroll Technician
- #102-05 – Administrative Assistant IV
- #110-05 – Systems Technician I - ROP

MSC (Rothman/Seal) to approve the eligibility lists.

11. PERSONNEL DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- None

12. PERSONNEL ACTIONS

- None

13. NEXT MEETING – July 19, 2006, 9:00 AM, Board Room

-Reschedule July 5 employee disciplinary hearing

Due to a scheduling conflict, the disciplinary hearing originally scheduled for July 5, 2006 at 10:00 AM needs to be rescheduled. MSC (Rothman/Seal) to reschedule the disciplinary hearing for July 19, 2006 at 10:00 AM.

14. ADJOURNMENT

- Meeting adjourned at 9:50 AM

Approved: Personnel Commission

By: _____ Date: _____